

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 MARK MAYES,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 AMAZON.COM.DEDC LLC,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C18-176 MJP

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

15  
16 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt.  
17 No. 91) of this Court's Order denying Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Appeal *in forma pauperis*  
18 (Dkt. No. 90). The Court DENIES the motion.

19 Under Local Rule 7(h), "[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored." LR 7(h). "The  
20 court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior  
21 ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its  
22 attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Id.; see also Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos  
23 Pharma, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009) (finding a motion for reconsideration warranted only  
24

1 when a district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or  
2 when there is an intervening change in the controlling law).

3 Plaintiff argues that he did not have a “fair attempt at justice” because his previous  
4 counsel withdrew and denying him *in forma pauperis* status would render an unfair economic  
5 hardship. (Dkt. No. 91.) He also argues Amazon improperly denied him Electronically Stored  
6 Information that he needed in order to support his claims. (Id.) Plaintiff is reiterating arguments  
7 already made and rejected by this Court, and he presents no new angle, evidence, or legal  
8 support. The Court previously denied Plaintiff’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Dkt. No.  
9 39), and in its Order denying Plaintiff Leave to Appeal *in forma pauperis*, this Court noted that  
10 Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment dealt exclusively with discovery issues that were  
11 previously decided by the Court. (Dkt. No. 71.) Because Plaintiff fails to show “manifest error  
12 in the prior ruling or . . . new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the  
13 Court’s] attention earlier with reasonable diligence,” reconsideration is not appropriate. LR 7(h).  
14 Plaintiff’s motion is DENIED.

15  
16 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

17 Dated June 18, 2019.

18  
19 

20 Marsha J. Pechman  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24